REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 10-14, 17-23, and 25-29 are present in this application. Claims 1, 3, 10, 19, 20, and 21 are independent claims.

35 USC 103(a) – Iwamura, Haines, Fuji

Claims 1-7, 9-14, 16-23, and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,883,621 (Iwamura) in view of U.S. Application Publication 2003/0080992 (Haines) and U.S. Patent 5,831,618 (Fuji). Applicant has amended the independent claims. Applicant traverses this rejection based on the claims as amended.

Summary of Aspects of Present Invention

According to the present specification, and as illustrated in Fig. 6, reception quality Ra 1, Ra 2, Rb 1, Rb 2, Rc 1, and Rc 2 of the transmitters A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2, C-1, and C-2 are obtained (step S 100). Next, average reception quality of transmitters existing in the rooms A, B, and C, Ra=(Ra 1 + Ra 2)/2, Rb=(Rb 1+Rb 2)/2, Rc=(Rc 1+Rc 2)/2, are obtained (S 101).

Then, the size of the display frames for indicating the rooms A, B, and C are obtained from the obtained average reception quality Ra, Rb, and Rc (S 102). That is, Lxa, Lxb, and Lxc which are the lengths in the X direction of the display frames of the rooms A, B, and C, and Lya, Lyb, and Lyc, which are the lengths in the Y direction are determined, so that a relation of Lxa:Lxb:Lxc=Lya:Lyb:Lyc=Ra:Rb:Rc is satisfied.

(specification as filed at page 33, line 23, to page 34, line 9).

Differences over Cited Prior Art

The Office Action admits that the combination of Iwamura and Haines does not teach a network map comprising images indicating a room in which a size of each image is according to the degree of reception regarding the transmission devices in the room. Instead, the Office Action alleges that Fuji teaches a network map comprising images indicating at least one room

(with reference to "Computer Room" in Branch Office 71 of Fig. 6), and alleges that "the size of images is according to how many transmission devices are located in each place or room such that images corresponding to places having more devices are larger." The Office Action goes on to explain that the size of image 72 in Fig. 6 having 8 devices can be compared to the size of image 70 having 3 devices; implying that the greater the number of devices in a room the larger the image size. (Office Action at paragraph bridging pages 3-4).

The Office Action then goes on to allege that in the combination of Fuji and Haines, "the size of each image is according to how many devices are located in the room indicated by the image (Fuji Fig. 6), and whether each device is located in the room is according to the degree of reception of each device (Haines para. 0021, 0042)."

Applicant disagrees. Applicant submits that Haines teaches a physical network map mapping physical location of network devices (para. 0020). Applicant submits that Haines does not teach changing the physical location of a network device, i.e., changing the location in the network map to another room as the degree of reception changes. In other words, Haines would require a change in physical location of a network device in order to show a change in location in the network map.

In any case, Applicant submits that Haines and Fuji do not teach a correlation between the number of physically located network devices and changes in reception condition. For example, in Haines a network device can be physically moved to a room that results in poorer reception, but is shown as an larger image because of a greater number of devices in the room that the network device was moved.

Subsequently, Applicant submits that although the combination of Fuji and Haines may indicate a relationship between the number of devices and the size of the image, the combination does not teach a relationship exhibited in the present invention where the size of each image becomes larger as the degree of reception (communication) becomes greater.

11

In order to clarify the claimed relationship between size of each image and degree of reception (communication), Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 10, 19, 20, and 21. Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn based on the claims as amended.

Claims 26, 28, 29

Further with respect to claims 26, 28, and 29, Applicant submits that Haines, Fuji, and Iwamura, either alone or in combination, fail to teach at least the claimed feature of "a size of each image is according to average of the degree of reception."

The Office Action alleges that the location of a transmission device is determined based on the average degree of reception with other devices (with reference to Haines at para. 0033), and the location is used to determine which room the device is in (Haines at paragraph 0043).

Applicant submits that to the contrary, Haines at paragraph 0033 discloses: "The location of the network device 220 may be estimated as an average of the closest points of intersection." In other words, in Haines, a point of intersection is determined based on the degree of the reception with a pair of other devices, and this operation is repeated as to another pair, so that plural points of intersection (435ab, ac, bc) are determined, and average thereof is determined as the location of the transmitting device. If the degree of the reception of plural devices is averaged as alleged by the Examiner, such an average would not result in a point of intersection that represents the location of the device. Subsequently, it would not be possible to determine the location of the transmission device based on an average of a degree of reception. In any case, Applicant submits that the "average" disclosed in paragraph 0033 of Haines does not pertain to the claimed average of the degree of reception for the transmission devices in each respective room, as recited in claims 26, 28, and 29.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicant submits that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness and requests that the rejection of at least claims 26, 28, and 29 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CG/RWD/:tm

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert Downs** Reg. No. 48,222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 22, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By _____ # 48222

Charles Gorenstein   *Robert Downs*
Registration No.: 29,271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

CG/RWD/:tm